
REMARKS

The Examiner has questioned the status of claim 21, stating that the claim was not addressed in the remarks of the prior response. This is not accurate.

In a restriction requirement dated April 8, 2009, the Examiner identified 5 inventions and eight species, requesting that the Applicants elect one invention group and one species per group.

Applicants elected, on May 8, 2008, Group I and Species 2, 3, 6 and 8. Applicants at that time addressed those claims not identified by the Examiner as belonging to any of the identified species, citing them to be generic.

All of the above was recounted in the Status of the Claims section of the prior response, page 32.

Claim 21 was not included in the elected claim group or species and is therefore considered to be withdrawn, as clearly stated in the Status of the Claims.

Claims 35-39, irrespective of the statement by Applicant in the prior response regarding the failure of the Examiner to include a status identifier on the cover page of the action, were substantively addressed. All of claims 35-39 are dependent upon claim 25. All of these claims were addressed in Section III, by number.

In light of the foregoing, it would appear that the rejection for non-compliance was in error, and no amendment is required.

Respectfully submitted,

ERIC TELLER ET AL.

By their Representatives,

Customer No. 87084

Date: June 27, 2009

By /John A. Monocello, III/

John A. Monocello, III
GTC Law Group LLP & Affiliates
Registration No. 51,022
Telephone No. 412-953-0696